# Reliability of Wireless Sensor Networks under a Heterogeneous Key Predistribution Scheme

Rashad Eletreby, *Student Member, IEEE,* and Osman Yağan, *Member, IEEE,*

arXiv:1604.00460v1 [math.OC] 2 Apr 2016

***Abstract*—We consider the network reliability problem in *secure* wireless sensor networks that employ a *heterogeneous* random key predistribution scheme. This scheme is introduced recently, as a generalization of the Eschenauer-Gligor scheme, to account for the cases when the network comprises sensors with varying level of resources or connectivity requirements; e.g., regular nodes vs. cluster heads. The scheme induces the *inhomogeneous* random key graph, denoted $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$, where each of the $n$ nodes are independently assigned to one of $r$ classes according to a probability distribution $\boldsymbol{\mu}=(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_r)$ and then a class-$i$ node is assigned $K_i$ keys uniformly at random from a pool of size $P$; two nodes that share a key are then connected by an edge. We analyze the *reliability* of $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$ against random link failures. Namely, we consider $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P,\alpha)$ formed by deleting each edge of $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$ independently with probability $1-\alpha$, and study the probability that the resulting graph i) has no isolated node; and ii) is connected. We present scaling conditions on $\boldsymbol{K}$, $P$, and $\alpha$ such that both events take place with probability zero or one, respectively, as the number of nodes gets large. We also present numerical results to support these zero-one laws in the finite-node regime.**

***Index Terms*—Wireless Sensor Networks, Security, Inhomogeneous Random Key Graphs, Reliability, Connectivity.**

## 1. Introduction

WIRELESS sensor networks (WSNs) consist of low-cost, low-power, small sensor nodes that are typically deployed in large numbers in application areas as diverse as military, health, environmental monitoring, etc [1]. In most cases, WSNs are deployed in hostile environments (e.g., battlefields) making it crucial to use cryptographic protection to secure sensor communications. To that end, significant efforts have been devoted to developing methods for securing WSNs, and *random key predistribution schemes* have been widely accepted as feasible solutions in the face of unique challenges WSNs present: limited computational capabilities and transmission power, lack of a priori knowledge of deployment configuration, and vulnerability to node capture attacks; e.g., see [2]–[5] for a detailed discussion on security challenges in WSNs and solutions based on key predistribution.

In this paper, we consider a *heterogeneous* key predistribution scheme introduced recently by Yağan [6] as a variation of the *classical* Eschenauer-Gligor (EG) scheme [2]. The heterogeneous key predistribution scheme accounts for the cases when the network comprises sensor nodes with varying level of resources (e.g., computational, memory, power) and varying level of security and connectivity requirements (e.g., regular nodes vs. cluster heads); this is indeed likely to be the case for many WSN applications [7]. According to this scheme, each of the $n$ sensors is independently assigned to class-$i$ with probability $\mu_i>0$, for each $i=1,\ldots,r$; obviously we have $\sum_{i=1}^{r}\mu_i=1$. Sensors from class-$i$ are each given $K_i$ keys selected uniformly at random from a pool of size $P$; put differently, the *number* of cryptographic keys assigned to a sensor is controlled by its priority class. Then, pairs of sensors that have at least one key in common can communicate securely after deployment. With $\boldsymbol{\mu}=\{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_r\}$ and $\boldsymbol{K}=\{K_1,\ldots,K_r\}$, we let $\mathbb{G}(n,\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$ denote the random graph induced by the heterogeneous key predistribution scheme. This model was referred to as the *inhomogeneous* random key graph in [6], wherein, zero-one laws for absence of isolated nodes and connectivity are established.

The main goal of this paper is to investigate the *reliability* of secure WSNs under the heterogeneous key predistribution scheme. To account for the possibility that links between two sensor nodes may fail (e.g., due to random failures, adversarial attacks, etc.), we apply a Bernoulli link-failure model to the inhomogeneous random key graph $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$. Namely, we assume that each link in $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$ is *operational* with probability $\alpha$ and fails with probability $1-\alpha$, independently from others. This models random attacks as well as random failures due to sensor malfunctioning or harsh environmental conditions. Understanding the reliability of WSNs against link failures is of interest in a multitude of applications where sensors are deployed in hostile environments (e.g., battlefield surveillance), or, are unattended for long periods of time (e.g., environmental monitoring), or, are used in life-critical applications (e.g., patient monitoring).

Let $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P,\alpha)$ denote the resulting random graph that contains all operational links in $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$. The network reliability problem is concerned [8], [9, Section 7.5] with deriving the probability that $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P,\alpha)$ exhibits certain desired properties – that captures the ability of the network to continue its services – as a function of the link failure probability $1-\alpha$. Here, we focus on two standard and related properties that the network i) has no *isolated* node, and ii) is connected. For arbitrary graphs with fixed size $n$, deriving these probabilities are known [10], [11] to be $\#P$-complete, meaning that no polynomial algorithm exists for their solution, unless $P=NP$. Given that it is not feasible to derive them, we study the *asymptotic* behavior of these probabilities as $n$ gets large, when the model parameters are scaled with $n$. We also consider the finite-node case via simulations.

Our contributions are as follows. We present conditions on how to scale $\boldsymbol{K}$, $P$ and the link failure probability $1-\alpha$ such

R. Eletreby and O. Yağan are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and CyLab, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, 15213 USA. E-mail: reletreby@cmu.edu, oyagan@ece.cmu.edu.

that the network $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K}_n,P_n,\alpha_n)$ is connected with probability approaching to one and zero, respectively, as $n$ grows unboundedly large. We establish an analogous zero-one law for $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K}_n,P_n,\alpha_n)$ to have no node that is isolated (i.e., that has zero edges). These sharp results are likely to be useful in *dimensioning* the heterogeneous scheme, namely *controlling* the key ring parameters $(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K})$, and the key pool size $P$ such that the network has a desired level of reliability against link failures. A particularly surprising conclusion derived from our results is that for a fixed mean number of keys per sensor, network reliability is tightly dependent on the *smallest* key ring size used in the network; see Section 3-A for details.

Our results complement and generalize several previous work in the literature. In particular, we complement the works [12], [13] that study the reliability of secure WSNs against a fixed number $k$ of link failures; in our case the number of failed links can be unboundedly large. Our results also contain as special cases the zero-one laws for connectivity in inhomogeneous random key graphs [6] and the network reliability results for the (homogeneous) random key graph [14]; see Section 3-B for details.

All limiting statements, including asymptotic equivalences are considered with the number of sensor nodes $n$ going to infinity. The indicator function of an event $E$ is denoted by $\mathbf{1}[E]$. We say that an event holds with high probability (whp) if it holds with probability 1 as $n\to\infty$. In comparing the asymptotic behavior of the sequences $\{a_n\},\{b_n\}$, we use the standard Landau notation, e.g., $a_n=o(b_n)$, $a_n=\omega(b_n)$, $a_n=O(b_n)$, $a_n=\Omega(b_n)$, and $a_n=\Theta(b_n)$. We also use $a_n\sim b_n$ to denote the asymptotic equivalence $\lim_{n\to\infty}a_n/b_n=1$.

## 2. The Model

The heterogeneous random key predistribution scheme introduced in [6] works as follows. Consider a network of $n$ sensors labeled as $v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_n$. Each sensor node is classified into one of the $r$ classes (e.g., priority levels) according to a probability distribution $\boldsymbol{\mu}=\{\mu_1,\mu_2,\ldots,\mu_r\}$ with $\mu_i>0$ for $i=1,\ldots,r$ and $\sum_{i=1}^r\mu_i=1$. Then, a class-$i$ node is assigned $K_i$ cryptographic keys selected uniformly at random from a key pool of size $P$. It follows that the key ring $\Sigma_x$ of node $v_x$ is a random variable (rv) with

$$\mathbb{P}[\Sigma_x=S\mid t_x=i]=\binom{P}{K_i}^{-1},\quad S\in\mathcal{P}_{K_i},$$

where $t_x$ denotes the class of $v_x$ and $\mathcal{P}_{K_i}$ is the collection of all subsets of $\{1,\ldots,P\}$ with size $K_i$. The classical key predistribution scheme of Eschenauer and Gligor [2] constitutes a special case of this model with $r=1$, i.e., when all sensors belong to the same class and receive the same number of keys; see also [15].

Let $\boldsymbol{K}=\{K_1,K_2,\ldots,K_r\}$ and assume without loss of generality that $K_1\le K_2\le\ldots\le K_r$. Consider a random graph $\mathbb{G}$ induced on the vertex set $\mathcal{V}=\{v_1,\ldots,v_n\}$ such that a pair of nodes $v_x$ and $v_y$ are adjacent, denoted by $v_x\sim_G v_y$, if they have at least one cryptographic key in common, i.e.,

$$v_x\sim_G v_y\quad\text{if}\quad\Sigma_x\cap\Sigma_y\neq\emptyset. \tag{1}$$

The adjacency condition (1) defines the inhomogeneous random key graph denoted by $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$ [6]. This model is also known in the literature as the *general random intersection graph*; e.g., see [12], [16], [17]. The probability $p_{ij}$ that a class-$i$ node and a class-$j$ node are adjacent is given by

$$p_{ij}=\mathbb{P}[v_x\sim_G v_y\mid t_x=i,t_y=j]=1-\frac{\binom{P-K_i}{K_j}}{\binom{P}{K_j}} \tag{2}$$

as long as $K_i+K_j\le P$; otherwise if $K_i+K_j>P$, we have $p_{ij}=1$. Let $\lambda_i$ denote the *mean* probability that a class-$i$ node is connected to another node in $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$. We have

$$\lambda_i=\mathbb{P}[v_x\sim_G v_y\mid t_x=i]=\sum_{j=1}^r p_{ij}\mu_j. \tag{3}$$

We also find it useful to define the *mean* key ring size by $K_{\text{avg}}$; i.e.,

$$K_{\text{avg}}=\sum_{j=1}^r K_j\mu_j. \tag{4}$$

To account for the possibility that links between two sensor nodes may fail (e.g., due to random failures, adversarial attacks, etc.), we apply a Bernoulli link-failure model to the inhomogeneous random key graph $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$: With $\alpha\in(0,1)$ let $\{B_{ij}(\alpha),1\le i<j\le n\}$ denote independent Bernoulli rvs, each with success probability $\alpha$. Then the link between sensors $v_x$ and $v_y$ is deemed to be operational (i.e., *up*) if $B_{xy}(\alpha)=1$, and not operational (i.e., *down*) if $B_{xy}(\alpha)=0$. Put differently, every edge in $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$ is deleted independently with probability $1-\alpha$[1].

Let $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P,\alpha)$ denote the resulting random graph that contains all the operational links in $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$. To simplify notation, we let $\boldsymbol{\theta}=(\boldsymbol{K},P)$, and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}=(\boldsymbol{\theta},\alpha)$. In $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})$, distinct nodes $v_x$ and $v_y$ are adjacent, denoted $v_x\sim v_y$, if and only if they are adjacent in $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$ *and* the edge $v_x\sim_G v_y$ is operational, i.e., has not failed. By independence, the probability of an edge between a class-$i$ node and a class-$j$ node in $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})$ is then given by

$$\mathbb{P}[v_x\sim v_y\mid t_x=i,t_y=j]=\alpha p_{ij}.$$

Similar to (3), we denote the mean edge probability for a class-$i$ node in $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})$ as $\Lambda_i$. It is clear that

$$\Lambda_i=\sum_{j=1}^r\mu_j\alpha p_{ij}=\alpha\lambda_i,\quad i=1,\ldots,r. \tag{5}$$

Throughout, we assume that the number of classes $r$ is fixed and does not scale with $n$, and so are the probabilities $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_r$. All other parameters are scaled with $n$.

## 3. Main Results and Discussion

We refer to a mapping $\boldsymbol{\Theta}=K_1,\ldots,K_r,P,\alpha:\mathbb{N}_0\to\mathbb{N}_0^{r+1}\times(0,1)$ as a *scaling* if

$$1\le K_{1,n}\le K_{2,n}\le\ldots\le K_{r,n}\le P_n/2 \tag{6}$$

for all $n=2,3,\ldots$. We note that under (6), the edge probability $p_{ij}$ is given by (2).

[1] An interesting direction for future work would be to consider a heterogeneous link-failure model, where the link between a type-$i$ and type-$j$ node fails with probability $1-\alpha_{ij}$.

### A. Results

We first present a zero-one law for the absence of isolated nodes in $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Consider a probability distribution $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_r\}$ with $\mu_i > 0$ for $i = 1,\ldots,r$ and a scaling $\boldsymbol{\Theta}: \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{N}_0^{r+1} \times (0,1)$ such that*

$$\Lambda_1(n) = \alpha_n \lambda_1(n) \sim c\frac{\log n}{n} \tag{7}$$

*for some $c > 0$. We have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left[\begin{array}{c}\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \text{ has}\\ \text{no isolated nodes}\end{array}\right] = \begin{cases}0 & \text{if } c<1\\ 1 & \text{if } c>1\end{cases} \tag{8}$$

The scaling condition (7) will often be used in the form

$$\Lambda_1(n) = c_n\frac{\log n}{n},\ n = 2,3,\ldots \tag{9}$$

with $\lim_{n\to\infty} c_n = c > 0$.

Next, we present an analogous result for connectivity.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Consider a probability distribution $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_r\}$ with $\mu_i > 0$ for $i = 1,\ldots,r$ and a scaling $\boldsymbol{\Theta}: \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{N}_0^{r+1} \times (0,1)$ such that (7) holds for some $c > 0$. Then, we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}[\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \text{ is connected}] = \begin{cases}0 & \text{if } c<1\\ 1 & \text{if } c>1\end{cases} \tag{10}$$

*under the additional conditions that*

$$P_n \geq \sigma n, \quad n = 1,2,\ldots \tag{11}$$

*for some $\sigma > 0$ and*

$$p_{11}(n) = \omega\left(\frac{1}{n\alpha_n}\right). \tag{12}$$

The resemblance of the results presented in Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 indicates that absence of isolated nodes and connectivity are asymptotically equivalent properties for $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$. Similar observations were made for other well-known random graph models as well; e.g., inhomogeneous random key graphs [6], ER graphs [9], and (homogeneous) random key graphs [15].

Conditions (11) and (12) are enforced mainly for technical reasons and they are only needed in the proof of the one-law of Theorem 3.2. We remark that these conditions are not constraining in real-world WSN implementations. In fact, (11) should hold in practice to ensure the resiliency of the WSN against node capture attacks [18]; typically it is suggested to have the key pool size be much larger than network size, i.e., $P_n = \omega(n)$. Condition (12) takes away from the flexibility of assigning very small key rings to a certain fraction of sensors, but it can still be satisfied easily in most real-world implementations. To provide a concrete example, one can set $P_n = n\log n$ and have $K_{1,n} = (\log n)^{1/2+\varepsilon}$ with any $\varepsilon > 0$ to satisfy (12) (see Lemma 5.2) for any $\alpha_n \leq 1/(\log n)^{\varepsilon}$. By setting $K_{\text{avg},n} = \log n^{3/2}$, we obtain a network that remains connected under random link failures with probability (up to) $1 - 1/(\log n)^{\varepsilon}$ (see Corollary 3.3).

Theorem 3.1 (resp. Theorem 3.2) states that $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ has no isolated node (resp. is connected) whp if the mean degree of class-1 nodes (that receive the smallest number $K_{1,n}$ of keys) is scaled as $(1+\epsilon)\log n$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. On the other hand, if this minimal mean degree scales as $(1-\epsilon)\log n$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, then whp $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ has an isolated node, and hence not connected. These results indicate that the minimum key ring size in the network has a significant impact on the reliability of $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)$.

The importance of the minimum key ring size on reliability can be seen more explicitly under a mild condition on the scaling, as shown in the next corollary.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Consider a probability distribution $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_r\}$ with $\mu_i > 0$ for $i = 1,\ldots,r$ and a scaling $\boldsymbol{\Theta}: \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{N}_0^{r+1} \times (0,1)$ such that $\lambda_1(n) = o(1)$ and*

$$\alpha_n\frac{K_{1,n}K_{\text{avg},n}}{P_n} \sim c\frac{\log n}{n} \tag{13}$$

*for some $c > 0$, where $K_{\text{avg},n}$ is as defined at (4). Then we have the zero-one law (8) for absence of isolated nodes. If, in addition, the conditions (11) and (12) are satisfied, then we also have the zero-one law (10) for connectivity.*

**Proof.** In view of (3), we see that $\lambda_1(n) = o(1)$ implies $p_{1j}(n) = o(1)$ for $j = 1,\ldots,r$. From Lemma 5.2, this then leads to $p_{1j}(n) \sim \frac{K_{1,n}K_{j,n}}{P_n}$, whence

$$\lambda_1(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{r}\mu_j p_{1j}(n) \sim \frac{K_{1,n}\sum_{j=1}^{r}\mu_j K_{j,n}}{P_n} = \frac{K_{1,n}K_{\text{avg},n}}{P_n}$$

Thus, the scaling conditions (7) and (13) are equivalent under $\lambda_1(n) = o(1)$ and Corollary 3.3 follows from Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2. ∎

We see from Corollary 3.3 that for a fixed mean number $K_{\text{avg},n}$ of keys per sensor, network reliability is directly affected by the minimum key ring size $K_{1,n}$. For example, reducing $K_{1,n}$ by half means that the smallest $\alpha_n$ for which the network remains connected whp is increased by two-fold, which then reduces the largest link failure probability $1-\alpha_n$ that can be sustained by a similar order; e.g., see Figure 2 for a numerical example demonstrating this phenomenon.

### B. Comparison with related work

Our main results extend the work by Yağan [6] who established zero-one laws for the connectivity of inhomogeneous random key graph $\mathbb{G}(n,\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$ without employing a link-failure model. It is clear that, although a crucial first step in the study of heterogeneous key predistribution schemes, the assumption that all links are operational, i.e., *reliable*, is not likely to hold in most practical settings. In this regard, our work extends the results [6] to more practical WSN scenarios where the unreliability of links are taken into account. In fact, by setting $\alpha_n = 1$ for each $n = 1,2,\ldots$ (i.e., by assuming that all links are *reliable*), our results reduce to those given in [6].

The reliability of secure WSNs was also studied in [14], [19], but under the Eschenauer-Gligor scheme [2] where all

sensors receive the same number of keys. However, when the network consists of sensors with varying level of resources (e.g., computational, memory, power) and/or with varying level of security and connectivity requirements, it may no longer be sensible to assign the same number of keys to all sensors. Our work addresses this issue by generalizing [14] to the cases where nodes can be assigned different number of keys. When $r = 1$, i.e., when all nodes belong to the same class and receive the same number of keys, our result recovers the main result in [14].

Another notable work that is related to ours is by Zhao et al. [12], [13], who studied the $k$-connectivity and $k$-robustness in the inhomogeneous random key graph. A graph is said to be $k$-connected if it remains connected after removal (i.e., *failure*) of any $k-1$ nodes. Thus, the results obtained in [12] ensure the reliability of the network against the failure of $k-1$ nodes, for some integer constant $k$. Our work complements these results by considering the case when *each and every* edge fails with probability $1-\alpha$, so that the total number of failed links is possibly infinite; e.g., as many as $O(n^2)$ links may fail.

Considering the asymptotic regime, a key question in network reliability analysis is whether or not there exists a threshold $\alpha_n^* \in (0,1)$ such that if $\alpha_n$ is slightly smaller than (resp. slightly larger than) $\alpha_n^*$ then the probability that $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K}_n,P_n,\alpha_n)$ is connected is close to zero (resp. close to one); e.g., see [9, Section 7.5]. Our results provide an answer to this question, in the affirmative, for inhomogeneous random key graphs. In particular, we see from (7) that the critical threshold is given by

$$\alpha_n^* = \frac{\log n}{n\lambda_1(n)}, \tag{14}$$

with $\alpha_n = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\alpha_n^*$ leading to network connectivity with probability one and zero, respectively, with arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$. Although asymptotic in nature, these results can still provide useful insights about the reliability of heterogeneous WSNs with number of sensors $n$ being on the order of hundreds; see Section 4 for numerical experiments.

## 4. Numerical Results

We present numerical results that support Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 in the finite node regime. In Figure 1, we fix the number of nodes at $n = 500$, the size of the key pool at $P = 10^4$, and consider the link-failure parameters $\alpha = 0.2$, $\alpha = 0.4$, $\alpha = 0.6$, and $\alpha = 0.8$, while varying the parameter $K_1$ (i.e., the smallest key ring size) from 5 to 35. The number of classes is fixed at 4 with $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \{0.25, 0.25, 0.25, 0.25\}$ and we set $K_2 = K_1+5$, $K_3 = K_1+10$, and $K_4 = K_1+15$. For each parameter pair $(\boldsymbol{K},\alpha)$, we generate 200 independent samples of the graph $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})$ and count the number of times (out of a possible 200) that the obtained graphs i) have no isolated nodes and ii) are connected. Dividing the counts by 200, we obtain the (empirical) probabilities for the events of interest. We observed that $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})$ is connected whenever it has no isolated nodes yielding the same empirical probability for both events. This is in parallel with the asymptotic equivalence of the two properties as implied by Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.




Fig. 1. Empirical probability that $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P,\alpha)$ is connected with $n = 500$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (1/4, 1/4, 1/4, 1/4)$, $\boldsymbol{K} = (K_1, K_1+5, K_1+10, K_1+15)$, and $P = 10^4$. Vertical dashed lines give the minimum $K_1$ for which (15) holds.

In Figure 1, we plot the empirical probability that $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})$ is connected as a function of $K_1$; for better visualization, we use the curve fitting tool of MATLAB. For each curve, we also show the *critical* threshold of connectivity "predicted" by Theorem 3.2 by a vertical dashed line. More specifically, the vertical dashed lines stand for the minimum integer $K_1$ such that

$$\lambda_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{4} \mu_j \left(1 - \frac{\binom{P-K_j}{K_1}}{\binom{P}{K_1}}\right) > \frac{1}{\alpha}\frac{\log n}{n}. \tag{15}$$

We see that the probability of connectivity transitions from zero to one within relatively small variation of $K_1$, with critical values of $K_1$ from (15) lying within this transition interval.

Figure 2 is generated in a similar manner with Figure 1, this time with an eye towards understanding the impact of the minimum key ring size $K_1$ on network reliability. To that end, we fix the number of classes at 2 with $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \{0.5, 0.5\}$ and consider four different key ring sizes $\boldsymbol{K}$ each with mean 40; we consider $\boldsymbol{K} = \{10, 70\}$, $\boldsymbol{K} = \{20, 50\}$, $\boldsymbol{K} = \{30, 50\}$, and $\boldsymbol{K} = \{40, 40\}$. We compare the probability of connectivity in the resulting networks with link failure probability ranging from zero to one. We see that although the average number of keys per sensor is kept constant in all four cases, network reliability improves dramatically as the minimum key ring size $K_1$ increases; e.g., with link failure probability $1-\alpha = 0.85$, the probability of connectivity is one when $K_1 = K_2 = 40$ while it drops to zero if we set $K_1 = 10$ while increasing $K_2$ to 70 so that the mean key ring size is still 40. This confirms the observations made via Corollary 3.3.

Next, we turn our attention to revealing the maximum tolerable link failure probability in $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$; i.e., the maximum value of $1-\alpha$ for which $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P,\alpha)$ is connected with probability one. After all, one of the main questions in sensor network design is to understand how we can control key ring sizes to achieve a desired level of reliability. Of particular interest will be to reveal the differences between the asymptotical results given in Theorem 3.2 and the simulation results with finite $n$.




Fig. 2. Empirical probability that $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P,\alpha)$ is connected with $n = 500$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (1/2, 1/2)$, and $P = 10^4$; we consider four choices of $\boldsymbol{K} = (K_1, K_2)$ each with the same mean.


Maximum Tolerable Link Failure Probability
$K_1$
simulation, $n = 500$
$p_{\max}$ with $c = 2$
$p_{\max}$ with $c = 1$
simulation, $n = 1000$
$p_{\max}$ with $c = 1.8$
$p_{\max}$ with $c = 1$

Fig. 3. Maximum tolerable link failure probability of $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$ with two different sets of parameters; namely, i) $n = 500$, $P = 10^4$, $K_2 = 40$, and ii) $n = 1000$, $P = 2 \times 10^4$, $K_2 = 60$. We calculate $p_{max}$ from (16).

A naive application of Theorem 3.2 suggests that for fixed $n, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{K}$, and $P$, $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P,\alpha)$ is connected with probability one as long as

$$\alpha \geq c\frac{\log n}{n\lambda_1}$$

for some $c > 1$, where $\lambda_1$ is defined at (3). This suggests that the inhomogeneous random key graph $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P)$ can tolerate a maximum link failure probability of

$$p_{\max} := 1 - \left(c\frac{\log n}{n\lambda_1}\right) \tag{16}$$

with arbitrary $c > 1$. Of course, given the asymptotic nature of Theorem 3.2, one would expect this result to have good accuracy only when $n$ is *very large*. Here, we are interested in checking the accuracy of (16) when $n$ is relatively small. To that end, we consider in Figure 3 two different settings, i) $n = 500$, $P = 10^4$, $K_2 = 40$, and ii) $n = 1000$, $P = 2 \times 10^4$, $K_2 = 60$. In both cases, we vary $K_1$ from 10 to 36. For each $K_1$, we obtain the *numerical* value of the maximum tolerable link failure probability by identifying the maximum value of $1-\alpha$ for which all 600 independently generated realizations of the graph $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{K},P,\alpha)$ turn out to be connected. We then compare these with the *theoretical* value $p_{\max}$ of the maximum link failure probability (using (16)) for various $c$ values.

Figure 3 shows, for both parameter settings, the simulation results along with the theoretical value $p_{\max}$ at the $c$ value that best matches to it; to provide a baseline, we also plot the $p_{\max}$ values corresponding to case $c = 1$ in both cases. We see that almost perfect match is obtained with only $c = 2$ in the case where $n = 500$, and with $c = 1.8$ when $n = 1000$, indicating that the results obtained here can be useful in designing WSNs with only hundreds of sensors; as $n$ gets large, one would expect to obtain a match with even smaller $c$ values, *eventually* approaching to $c = 1$. For instance, a desired level of reliability can be attained in a network with $n = 500$ sensors by using key ring sizes that are only $\sqrt{2} \simeq 1.44$-times larger from those prescribed for the asymptotic regime with $n$ going to $\infty$.

## 5. Preliminaries

Several technical results are collected here for convenience. The first result follows easily from the scaling condition (6).

**Proposition 5.1** ([6, Proposition 4.1]). *For any scaling $K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_r, P : \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{N}_0^{r+1}$, we have (in view of (6))*

$$\lambda_1(n) \leq \lambda_2(n) \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_r(n) \tag{17}$$

*for each $n = 2, 3, \ldots$.*

**Lemma 5.2** ([6, Lemma 4.2]). *Consider any scaling $K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_r, P : \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{N}_0^{r+1}$. For any $i, j = 1, \ldots, r$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} p_{ij}(n) = 0 \quad \textit{if and only if} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{K_{i,n}K_{j,n}}{P_n} = 0$$

*and we have the asymptotic equivalence*

$$p_{ij}(n) \sim \frac{K_{i,n}K_{j,n}}{P_n}. \tag{18}$$

**Proposition 5.3** ([6, Proposition 4.4]). *For any set of positive integers $K_1, \ldots, K_r, P$ and any scalar $a \geq 1$, we have*

$$\frac{\binom{P-\lceil aK_i\rceil}{K_j}}{\binom{P}{K_j}} \leq \left(\frac{\binom{P-K_i}{K_j}}{\binom{P}{K_j}}\right)^a, \quad i, j = 1, \ldots, r. \tag{19}$$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Consider a scaling $K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_r, P : \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{N}_0^{r+1}$ such that (7) holds. We have*

$$c_n\frac{\log n}{n\alpha_n} \leq p_{1r}(n) \leq \frac{c_n}{\mu_r}\frac{\log n}{n\alpha_n} \tag{20}$$

*If in addition (12) holds, we have*

$$p_{rr}(n) = o\left(\frac{(\log n)^2}{n\alpha_n}\right). \tag{21}$$

A proof of Lemma 5.4 is given in Appendix A.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Under (12), we have*

$$\frac{K_{1,n}^2}{P_n} = \omega\left(\frac{1}{n\alpha_n}\right), \tag{22}$$

*and*

$$K_{1,n} = \omega(1). \tag{23}$$

**Proof.** It is a simple matter to check that $p_{11}(n) \leq \frac{K_{1,n}^2}{P_n - K_{1,n}}$; see [15, Proposition 7.1-7.2] for a proof. In view of (6) this gives $p_{11}(n) \leq 2\frac{K_{1,n}^2}{P_n}$. Thus, we have

$$\frac{K_{1,n}^2}{P_n} = \Omega\left(p_{11}(n)\right) = \omega\left(\frac{1}{n\alpha_n}\right).$$

From (11), (22), and $\alpha_n \leq 1$, we readily obtain (23). ∎

Other useful bounds that will be used throughout are

$$(1 \pm x) \leq e^{\pm x}, \quad x \in (0,1) \tag{24}$$

$$\binom{n}{\ell} \leq \left(\frac{en}{\ell}\right)^{\ell}, \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, n, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots \tag{25}$$

$$\sum_{\ell=2}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \binom{n}{\ell} \leq 2^n \tag{26}$$

Finally, we find it useful to write

$$\log(1-x) = -x - \Psi(x) \tag{27}$$

where $\Psi(x) = \int_0^x \frac{t}{1-t}\,\mathrm{dt}$. From L'Hôpital's Rule, we have

$$\lim_{x \to 0} \frac{\Psi(x)}{x^2} = \frac{-x - \log(1-x)}{x^2} = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{28}$$

## 6. Proof of Theorem 3.1

### A. Establishing the one-law

The proof of Theorem 3.1 relies on the method of first and second moments applied to the number of isolated nodes in $\mathbb{G}(n; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$. Let $I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ denote the total number of isolated nodes in $\mathbb{G}(n; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$, namely,

$$I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}[v_\ell \text{ is isolated in } \mathbb{G}(n; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] \tag{29}$$

The method of first moment [20, Eqn. (3.10), p. 55] gives

$$1 - \mathbb{E}[I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] \leq \mathbb{P}[I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) = 0]$$

It is clear that in order to establish the one-law, namely that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left[I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta_n}) = 0\right] = 1$, we need to show that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] = 0. \tag{30}$$

Recalling (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\right] \\
&= n \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mu_i \mathbb{P}\left[v_1 \text{ is isolated in } \mathbb{G}(n; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \mid t_1 = i\right] \\
&= n \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mu_i \mathbb{P}\left[\cap_{j=2}^{n} [v_j \nsim v_1] \mid v_1 \text{ is class i}\right] \\
&= n \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mu_i \left(\mathbb{P}\left[v_2 \nsim v_1 \mid v_1 \text{ is class i}\right]\right)^{n-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where (31) follows by the independence of the rvs $\{v_j \nsim v_1\}_{j=1}^n$ given $\Sigma_1$. By conditioning on the class of $v_2$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[v_2 \nsim v_1 \mid t_1 = i] &= \sum_{j=1}^{r} \mu_j \mathbb{P}[v_2 \nsim v_1 \mid t_1 = i, t_2 = j] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{r} \mu_j (1 - \alpha p_{ij}) \\
&= 1 - \Lambda_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Using (32) in (31), and recalling (17) and (24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] &= n \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mu_i \left(1 - \Lambda_i(n)\right)^{n-1} \\
&\leq n \left(1 - \Lambda_1(n)\right)^{n-1} \\
&= n \left(1 - c_n \frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{n-1} \\
&\leq e^{\log n \left(1 - c_n \frac{n-1}{n}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $n$ goes to infinity, we immediately get (30) since $\lim_{n\to\infty}(1 - c_n \frac{n-1}{n}) = 1 - c < 0$ under the enforced assumptions (with $c > 1$) and the one-law is established. ∎

### B. Establishing the zero-law

Our approach in establishing the zero-law relies on the method of second moment applied to a variable that counts the number of nodes that are class-1 and isolated. Clearly if we can show that whp there exists at least one class-1 node that is isolated under the enforced assumptions (with $c < 1$) then the zero-law would immediately follow.

Let $Y_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ denote the number of nodes that are class-1 and isolated in $\mathbb{G}(n; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$, and let

$$x_{n,i}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) = \mathbf{1}[t_i = 1 \cap v_i \text{ is isolated in } \mathbb{G}(n; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)],$$

then we have $Y_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{n,i}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$. By applying the method of second moments [20, Remark 3.1, p. 55] on $Y_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}[Y_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) = 0] \leq 1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)]^2}{\mathbb{E}[Y_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^2]} \tag{33}$$

where

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] = n\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] \tag{34}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Y_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^2] =& n\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] \\
&+ n(n-1)\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)]
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

by exchangeability and the binary nature of the rvs $\{x_{n,i}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\}_{i=1}^n$. Using (34) and (35), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^2]}{\mathbb{E}[Y_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)]^2} =& \frac{1}{n\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)]} \\
&+ \frac{n-1}{n} \frac{\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)]}{\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)]^2}
\end{aligned}$$

In order to establish the zero-law, we need to show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] = \infty,$$

and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)]}{\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)]^2}\right) \le 1. \tag{36}$$

**Proposition 6.1.** *Consider a scaling $K_1,\ldots,K_r,P:\mathbb{N}_0\to\mathbb{N}_0^{r+1}$ and a scaling $\alpha:\mathbb{N}_0\to(0,1)$ such that (7) holds with $\lim_{n\to\infty}c_n = c > 0$. Then, we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] = \infty, \quad \textit{if } c < 1$$

*Proof:* We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&n\mathbb{E}\left[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\right]\\
&= n\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}[t_1 = 1 \cap v_1 \text{ is isolated in } \mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)]\right]\\
&= n\mu_1\mathbb{P}\left[v_1 \text{ is isolated in } \mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \mid t_1 = 1\right]\\
&= n\mu_1\mathbb{P}\left[\cap_{j=2}^n [v_j \nsim v_1] \mid t_1 = 1\right]\\
&= n\mu_1\mathbb{P}\left[v_2 \nsim v_1 \mid t_1 = 1\right]^{n-1}\\
&= n\mu_1\left(\sum_{j=1}^r \mu_j\mathbb{P}\left[v_2 \nsim v_1 \mid t_1 = 1, t_2 = j\right]\right)^{n-1}\\
&= n\mu_1\left(\sum_{j=1}^r \mu_j(1-\alpha_n p_{1j})\right)^{n-1} \qquad (37)\\
&= n\mu_1\left(1-\Lambda_1(n)\right)^{n-1} = \mu_1 e^{\beta_n} \qquad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\beta_n = \log n + (n-1)\log(1-\Lambda_1(n)).$$

Recalling (27), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_n &= \log n - (n-1)\left(\Lambda_1(n) + \Psi(\Lambda_1(n))\right)\\
&= \log n - (n-1)\left(c_n\frac{\log n}{n} + \Psi\left(c_n\frac{\log n}{n}\right)\right)\\
&= \log n\left(1 - c_n\frac{n-1}{n}\right)\\
&\quad - (n-1)\left(c_n\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^2\frac{\Psi\left(c_n\frac{\log n}{n}\right)}{\left(c_n\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^2} \qquad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling (28), we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\Psi\left(c_n\frac{\log n}{n}\right)}{\left(c_n\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^2} = \frac{1}{2} \tag{40}$$

since $c_n\frac{\log n}{n} = o(1)$. Thus, $\beta_n = \log n\left(1 - c_n\frac{n-1}{n}\right) - o(1)$. Using (38), (39), (40), and letting $n$ go to infinity, we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] = \infty$$

whenever $\lim_{n\to\infty}c_n = c < 1$. ∎

**Proposition 6.2.** *Consider a scaling $K_1,\ldots,K_r,P:\mathbb{N}_0\to\mathbb{N}_0^{r+1}$ and a scaling $\alpha:\mathbb{N}_0\to(0,1)$ such that (7) holds with $\lim_{n\to\infty}c_n = c > 0$. Then, we have (36) if $c < 1$.*

*Proof:* Consider fixed $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})\right]\\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}[v_1 \text{ is isolated }, v_2 \text{ is isolated} \cap t_1 = 1, t_2 = 1]\right]\\
&= \mu_1^2\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}[v_1 \text{ is isolated }, v_2 \text{ is isolated}] \,\middle|\, t_1 = 1, t_2 = 1\right]\\
&= \mu_1^2\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}[v_1 \nsim v_2]\prod_{m=3}^n \mathbf{1}[v_m \nsim v_1, v_m \nsim v_2] \,\middle|\, t_1 = t_2 = 1\right]
\end{aligned}$$

Now we condition on $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_2$ and note that i) $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_2$ determine $t_1$ and $t_2$; and ii) the events $[v_1 \nsim v_2], \{[v_m \nsim v_1 \cap v_m \nsim v_2]\}_{m=3}^n$ are mutually independent given $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_2$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})]\\
&= \mu_1^2\mathbb{E}\Bigg[\mathbb{P}\left[v_1 \nsim v_2 \,\middle|\, \Sigma_1,\Sigma_2\right]\times \qquad (41)\\
&\quad \prod_{m=3}^n \mathbb{P}\left[v_m \nsim v_1 \cap v_m \nsim v_2 \,\middle|\, \Sigma_1,\Sigma_2\right] \,\Bigg|\, t_1 = t_2 = 1\Bigg]
\end{aligned}$$

Define the $\{0,1\}$-valued rv $u(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ by

$$u(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \mathbf{1}[\Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2 \neq \emptyset]. \tag{42}$$

Next, with $\ell = 1,2,\ldots,n-1$, define $\nu_{\ell,j}(\alpha)$ by

$$\nu_{\ell,j}(\alpha) := \{i = 1,2,\ldots,\ell : B_{ij}(\alpha) = 1\} \tag{43}$$

for each $j = \ell+1,\ldots,n$. Namely, $\nu_{\ell,j}(\alpha)$ is the set of nodes in $\{v_1,\ldots,v_\ell\}$ whose *potential* link with node $v_j$ will not fail. With these definitions in mind, (41) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})]\\
&= \mu_1^2\mathbb{E}\left[(1-\alpha)^{u(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\prod_{m=3}^n \frac{\binom{P-\left|\cup_{i\in\nu_{2,m}(\alpha)}\Sigma_i\right|}{|\Sigma_m|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma_m|}} \,\middle|\, t_1 = t_2 = 1\right]
\end{aligned}$$

Conditioned on $u(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$ and $v_1, v_2$ being class-1, we have

$$\left|\cup_{i\in\nu_{2,m}(\alpha)}\Sigma_i\right| = |\nu_{2,m}(\alpha)|\,K_1.$$

Also, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[u(\boldsymbol{\theta_n}) = 0 \mid t_1 = t_2 = 1] = 1 - p_{11}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})\ \mathbf{1}[u(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0]]\\
&= \mu_1^2(1-p_{11})\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{m=3}^n \frac{\binom{P-|\nu_{2,m}(\alpha)K_1|}{|\Sigma_m|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma_m|}}\right]\\
&= \mu_1^2(1-p_{11})\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\binom{P-|\nu_{2,3}(\alpha)|K_1}{|\Sigma_3|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma_3|}}\right]^{n-2}\\
&= \mu_1^2(1-p_{11})\left(\sum_{j=1}^r \mu_j\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\binom{P-|\nu_{2,3}(\alpha)|K_1}{|\Sigma_3|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma_3|}} \,\middle|\, t_3 = j\right]\right)^{n-2}\\
&= \mu_1^2(1-p_{11})\left(\sum_{j=1}^r \mu_j\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\binom{P-|\nu_{2,3}(\alpha)|K_1}{K_j}}{\binom{P}{K_j}}\right]\right)^{n-2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \mu_1^2(1-p_{11})\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{r}\mu_j\left(\frac{\binom{P-K_1}{K_j}}{\binom{P}{K_j}}\right)^{|\nu_{2,3}(\alpha)|}\right]^{n-2}$$

where we use (19) in the last step.

Now, let $Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ denote a rv that takes the value

$$\frac{\binom{P-K_1}{K_j}}{\binom{P}{K_j}} \quad \text{with probability} \quad \mu_j, \quad j=1,\ldots,r. \tag{44}$$

In other words, $Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1-p_{1j}$ with probability $\mu_j$ so that $\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = 1-\lambda_1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})\mathbf{1}\left[u(\boldsymbol{\theta})=0\right]]\\ &\leq \mu_1^2(1-p_{11})\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{|\nu_{2,3}(\alpha)|}\right]^{n-2}\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Under the independent Bernoulli link-failure model, we have that $|\nu_{2,3}(\alpha)|$ is a Binomial rv, i.e., $|\nu_{2,3}(\alpha)| =_{st} \text{Bin}(2,\alpha)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu_1^2(1-p_{11})\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{|\nu_{2,3}(\alpha)|}\right]^{n-2} \qquad (46)\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{2}\binom{2}{i}\alpha^i(1-\alpha)^{2-i}Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^i\right]^{n-2}\\ &= \mu_1^2(1-p_{11})\mathbb{E}\left[(1-\alpha)^2+2\alpha(1-\alpha)Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})+\alpha^2Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^2\right]^{n-2}\end{aligned}$$

Conditioning on $u(\boldsymbol{\theta})=1$ and $t_1=t_2=1$, we have

$$|\cup_{i\in\nu_{2,m}(\alpha)}\Sigma_i| = \begin{cases}0 & \text{if } |\nu_{2,m}(\alpha)|=0\\ K_1 & \text{if } |\nu_{2,m}(\alpha)|=1\\ 2K_1-|\Sigma_1\cap\Sigma_2| & \text{if } |\nu_{2,m}(\alpha)|=2\end{cases}$$

and by a crude bounding argument, we have

$$|\cup_{i\in\nu_{2,m}(\alpha)}\Sigma_i| \geq K_1\mathbf{1}[|\nu_{2,m}(\alpha)|>0] \tag{47}$$

Using (47) and recalling the analysis for $\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})\mathbf{1}[u(\boldsymbol{\theta})=0]]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})\mathbf{1}[u(\boldsymbol{\theta})=1]]\\ &\leq \mu_1^2p_{11}(1-\alpha)\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{\mathbf{1}[|\nu_{2,3}(\alpha)|>0]}\right]^{n-2}\\ &= \mu_1^2p_{11}(1-\alpha)\mathbb{E}\left[(1-\alpha)^2+\left(1-(1-\alpha)^2\right)Z_n\right]^{n-2}\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Combining (45), (46), and (48), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})]\\ &= \mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})\left(\mathbf{1}[u(\boldsymbol{\theta})=0]+\mathbf{1}[u(\boldsymbol{\theta})=1]\right)]\\ &\leq \mu_1^2(1-p_{11})\Big((1-\alpha)^2+2\alpha(1-\alpha)\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})]\\ &\quad+\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^2\right]\Big)^{n-2}+\mu_1^2p_{11}(1-\alpha)\Big((1-\alpha)^2\\ &\quad+\left(1-(1-\alpha)^2\right)\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})]\Big)^{n-2}\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

It is clear from (37) and the definition of $Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})] &= \mu_1\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r}\mu_j(1-\alpha p_{1j})\right)^{n-1}\\ &= \mu_1\left((1-\alpha)+\alpha\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right]\right)^{n-1}\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Combining (49) and (50), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})x_{n,2}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})]}{\mathbb{E}[x_{n,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]^2}\\ &\leq (1-p_{11})\frac{\left((1-\alpha)^2+2\alpha(1-\alpha)\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})]+\alpha^2\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^2]\right)^{n-2}}{\left((1-\alpha)+\alpha\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right]\right)^{2(n-1)}}\\ &\quad+p_{11}\frac{\left((1-\alpha)^2+\left(1-(1-\alpha)^2\right)\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})]\right)^{n-2}}{\left((1-\alpha)+\alpha\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right]\right)^{2(n-1)}}\\ &:= A+B\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where we use the fact that $1-\alpha\leq 1$.

We now consider a scaling $\boldsymbol{\Theta}:\mathbb{N}_0\to\mathbb{N}_0^{r+1}\times(0,1)$ as stated in Proposition 6.2 and bound the terms $A$ and $B$ in turn. Our goal is to show that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}(A+B)\leq 1. \tag{52}$$

First, we write $\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)^2] = \mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)]^2 + var[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)]$, where $var[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)]$ can be bounded by the Popoviciu's inequality [21, p. 9] as follows

$$\begin{aligned}var[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)] &\leq \frac{1}{4}\left(\max(Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n))-\min(Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n))\right)^2\\ &= \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\binom{P_n-K_{1,n}}{K_{1,n}}}{\binom{P_n}{K_{1,n}}}-\frac{\binom{P_n-K_{1,n}}{K_{r,n}}}{\binom{P_n}{K_{r,n}}}\right)^2\\ &\leq \frac{1}{4}\left(1-\frac{\binom{P_n-K_{1,n}}{K_{r,n}}}{\binom{P_n}{K_{r,n}}}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{4}\left(p_{1r}(n)\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Then, we get from the scaling condition (9) and (A.1) that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)]^2+\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{c_n}{\mu_r}\frac{\log n}{n\alpha_n}\right)^2$$

Reporting this into (51) we get

$$\begin{aligned}&A\\ &\leq (1-p_{11})\frac{\left(\left((1-\alpha_n)+\alpha_n\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)]\right)^2+\left(\frac{c_n}{2\mu_r}\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^2\right)^{n-2}}{\left((1-\alpha_n)+\alpha_n\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)\right]\right)^{2(n-1)}}\\ &= (1+o(1))(1-p_{11})\left(1+\left(\frac{\frac{c_n}{2\mu_r}\frac{\log n}{n}}{1-\alpha_n+\alpha_n\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n\right]}\right)^2\right)^{n-2}\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that

$$\left((1-\alpha_n)+\alpha_n\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)]\right)^2 = \left(1-\alpha_n\lambda_1(n)\right)^2 = 1-o(1) \tag{53}$$

since $\alpha_n\lambda_1(n) = c_n\log n/n$. Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(1+\left(\frac{\frac{c_n}{2\mu_r}\frac{\log n}{n}}{1-\alpha_n+\alpha_n\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n\right]}\right)^2\right)^{n-2}\\ &\leq \exp\left\{n\left(\frac{\frac{c_n}{2\mu_r}\frac{\log n}{n}}{1-c_n\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)^2\right\} = o(1)\end{aligned}$$

since $\lim_{n\to\infty}c_n = c>0$ and $\mu_r>0$. Thus, we obtain the bound

$$A\leq(1-p_{11})\left(1+o(1)\right). \tag{54}$$

We now consider the second term in (51). Recall (53) and that $\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)\right] = 1 - \lambda_1(n) = 1 - c_n \log n/n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \frac{p_{11}}{\left(1-\alpha_n+\alpha_n\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)\right]\right)^2} \\ &\quad \times \left(1+\frac{\alpha_n^2\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)](1-\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)])}{\left(1-\alpha_n+\alpha_n\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)\right]\right)^2}\right)^{n-2} \\ &\leq p_{11}(1+o(1))\exp\left\{n\frac{\alpha_n^2 c_n\frac{\log n}{n\alpha_n}(1-c_n\frac{\log n}{n\alpha_n})}{(1-c_n\frac{\log n}{n})^2}\right\} \\ &\leq p_{11}(1+o(1))\exp\left\{\frac{c_n\alpha_n\log n}{\left(1-c_n\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^2}\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

We will now establish the desired result (52) by using (54) and (55). Our approach is based on the subsubsequence principle [20, p. 12] and considering the cases $\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n\log n = 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n\log n \in (0,\infty]$ separately.

*a) Assume that* $\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n\log n = 0$*:* From (55) we get $B \leq (1+o(1))p_{11}$ and upon using (54) we see that $A + B \leq (1+o(1))$ establishing (52) along subsequences with $\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n\log n = 0$.

*b) Assume that* $\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n\log n \in (0,\infty]$*:* Since $p_{1j}$ is monotonically increasing in $j = 1,\ldots,r$ (see (17)), we have

$$\lambda_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{r}\mu_j p_{1j} \geq p_{11}\sum_{j=1}^{r}\mu_j = p_{11}$$

Thus, $p_{11} \leq \lambda_1(n) = c_n\log n/(\alpha_n n)$. Then, (55) gives

$$\begin{aligned} B &\leq (1+o(1))\,\frac{c_n\log n}{\alpha_n n}\exp\left\{\frac{c_n\alpha_n\log n}{(1-c_n\log n/n)^2}\right\} \\ &= (1+o(1))\,\frac{c_n(\log n)^2}{\alpha_n\log n}\times n^{-1+\frac{c_n\alpha_n}{(1-c_n\log n/n)^2}} \\ &= o(1) \end{aligned}$$

since $\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n\log n > 0$ along this subsequence and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} -1+\frac{c_n\alpha_n}{(1-c_n\log n/n)^2} < 0$$

given that $\lim_{n\to\infty}c_n = c < 1$. From (54) and the fact that $p_{11}\leq 1$, we have $A \leq 1+o(1)$, and (52) follows.

The two cases considered cover all the possibilities for the limit of $\alpha_n\log n$. By virtue of the subsubsequence principle [20, p. 12], we get (52) without any condition on the sequence $\alpha_n\log n$; i.e., we obtain (52) even when the sequence $\alpha_n\log n$ does not have a limit! ∎

## 7. Proof of Theorem 3.2

Let $C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ denote the event that the graph $\mathbb{G}(n,\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ is connected, and with a slight abuse of notation, let $I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ denote the event that the graph $\mathbb{G}(n,\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ has no isolated nodes. It is clear that if a random graph is connected then it does not have any isolated node, hence

$$C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \subseteq I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$$

and we get

$$\mathbb{P}[C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] \leq \mathbb{P}[I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] \tag{56}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}[C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^c] = \mathbb{P}[I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^c] + \mathbb{P}[C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^c \cap I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)]. \tag{57}$$

In view of (56), we obtain the zero-law for connectivity, i.e., that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}[\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \text{ is connected}] = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad c < 1,$$

immediately from the zero-law part of Theorem 3.1, i.e., from that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}[I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] = 0$ if $c<1$. It remains to establish the one-law for connectivity. In the remainder of this section, we assume that (7) holds for some $c > 1$. From Theorem 3.1 and (57), we see that the one-law for connectivity, i.e., that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}[\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \text{ is connected}] = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad c > 1,$$

will follow if we show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}[C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^c \cap I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] = 0. \tag{58}$$

Our approach will be to find a suitable upper bound for (58) and prove that it goes to zero as $n$ goes to infinity with $c > 1$.

We now work towards deriving an upper bound for (58); then in Section 8 we will show that the bound goes to zero as $n$ gets large. Define the event $E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{X})$ via

$$E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{X}) := \cup_{S\subseteq\mathcal{N}:|S|\geq 1}\left[|\cup_{i\in S}\Sigma_i| \leq X_{|S|}\right]$$

where $\mathcal{N} = \{1,\ldots,n\}$ and $\boldsymbol{X} = [X_1\ \cdots\ X_n]$ is an $n$-dimensional array of integers. Let

$$L_n := \min\left(\left\lfloor\frac{P}{K_1}\right\rfloor, \left\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\right\rfloor\right) \tag{59}$$

and

$$X_\ell = \begin{cases} \lfloor\beta\ell K_1\rfloor & \ell = 1,\ldots,L_n \\ \lfloor\gamma P\rfloor & \ell = L_n+1,\ldots,n \end{cases} \tag{60}$$

for some $\beta$ and $\gamma$ in $(0,\frac{1}{2})$ that will be specified later. In words, $E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{X})$ denotes the event that there exists $\ell = 1,\ldots,n$ such that the number of unique keys stored by at least one subset of $\ell$ sensors is less than $\lfloor\beta\ell K_1\rfloor\,\mathbf{1}[\ell\leq L_n] + \lfloor\gamma P\rfloor\,\mathbf{1}[\ell > L_n]$. Using a crude bound, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}[C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^c \cap I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}[E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n,\boldsymbol{X}_n)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}[C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^c \cap I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n,\boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Thus, (58) will be established by showing that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}[E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n,\boldsymbol{X}_n)] = 0, \tag{62}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}[C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^c\cap I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n,\boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] = 0 \tag{63}$$

The next proposition establishes (62).

**Proposition 7.1.** *Consider scalings $K_1,\ldots,K_r,P : \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{N}_0^{r+1}$ and $\alpha : \mathbb{N}_0 \to (0,1)$ such that (7) holds for some $c > 1$, (11) and (12) hold. Then, we have (62) where $\boldsymbol{X}_n$ is as*

*specified in (60),* $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ *and* $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ *are selected such that*

$$\max\left(2\beta\sigma, \beta\left(\frac{e^2}{\sigma}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{1-2\beta}}\right) < 1 \tag{64}$$

$$\max\left(2\left(\sqrt{\gamma}\left(\frac{e}{\gamma}\right)^{\gamma}\right)^{\sigma}, \sqrt{\gamma}\left(\frac{e}{\gamma}\right)^{\gamma}\right) < 1 \tag{65}$$

*Proof:* The proof is similar to [6, Proposition 7.2]. Results only require the conditions (11) and (23) to hold. The latter condition is clearly established in Lemma 5.5. ∎

The rest of the paper is devoted to establishing (63) under the enforced assumptions on the scalings and with $\boldsymbol{X}_n$ as specified in (60), $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ selected small enough such that (64) holds, and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ selected small enough such that (65) holds. We denote by $\mathbb{G}(n, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)(S)$ a subgraph of $\mathbb{G}(n, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ whose vertices are restricted to the set $S$. Define the events

$$\begin{aligned}
C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n, S) &:= [\mathbb{G}(n, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)(S) \text{ is connected}] \\
B_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n, S) &:= [\mathbb{G}(n, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)(S) \text{ is isolated}] \\
A_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n, S) &:= C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n, S) \cap B_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n, S)
\end{aligned}$$

In other words, $A_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n, S)$ encodes the event that $\mathbb{G}(n, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)(S)$ is a *component*, i.e., a connected subgraph that is isolated from the rest of the graph. The key observation is that a graph is *not* connected if and only if it has a component on vertices $S$ with $1 \leq |S| \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$; note that if vertices $S$ form a component then so do vertices $\mathcal{N} - S$. The event $I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ eliminates the possibility of $\mathbb{G}(n, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)(S)$ containing a component of size one (i.e., an isolated node), whence we have

$$C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^c \cap I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \subseteq \cup_{S \in \mathcal{N}: 2 \leq |S| \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} A_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n, S)$$

and the conclusion

$$\mathbb{P}[C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^c \cap I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] \leq \sum_{S \in \mathcal{N}: 2 \leq |S| \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \mathbb{P}[A_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n, S)]$$

follows. By exchangeability, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}[C_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)^c \cap I_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell=2}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \left( \sum_{S \in \mathcal{N}_{n,\ell}} \mathbb{P}[A_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n, S) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] \right) \\
&= \sum_{\ell=2}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \binom{n}{\ell} \mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c]
\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{n,\ell}$ denotes the collection of all subsets of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ with exactly $\ell$ elements, and $A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ denotes the event that the set $\{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ of nodes form a component. As before we have $A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) = C_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap B_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$, where $C_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ denotes the event that $\{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ is connected and $B_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ denotes the event that $\{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ is isolated from the rest of the graph.

For each $\ell = 1, \ldots, n-1$, we have

$$B_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) = \bigcap_{m=\ell+1}^{n} \left[ \left( \cup_{i \in \nu_{\ell,m}(\alpha_n)} \Sigma_i \right) \cap \Sigma_m = \emptyset \right]$$

with $\nu_{\ell,m}(\alpha_n)$ as defined in (43). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left[B_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \mid \Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_\ell\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[ \prod_{m=\ell+1}^{n} \frac{\binom{P - |\cup_{i \in \nu_{\ell,m}(\alpha_n)} \Sigma_i|}{|\Sigma_m|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma_m|}} \;\middle|\; \Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_\ell \right] \\
&= \prod_{m=\ell+1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{\binom{P - |\cup_{i \in \nu_{\ell,m}(\alpha_n)} \Sigma_i|}{|\Sigma_m|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma_m|}} \;\middle|\; \Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_\ell \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{\binom{P - |\cup_{i \in \nu_{\ell}(\alpha_n)} \Sigma_i|}{|\Sigma|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma|}} \;\middle|\; \Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_\ell \right]^{n-\ell}
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

noting the fact that the collection of rvs $\{\nu_{\ell,m}, \Sigma_m : m = \ell + 1, \ldots, n\}$ are mutually independent *and* identically distributed. Here, $\nu_\ell(\alpha_n)$ denotes a generic rv distributed identically with $\nu_{\ell,m}(\alpha_n)$ for any $m = \ell + 1, \ldots, n$. Similarly, $|\Sigma|$ denotes a rv that takes the value $K_j$ with probability $\mu_j$.

We will leverage the expression (67) in (66) in the following manner. Note that on the event $E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c$, we have

$$\left| \cup_{i \in \nu_\ell(\alpha_n)} \Sigma_i \right| \geq \left( X_{n,\nu_\ell(\alpha_n)} + 1 \right) \mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha_n)| > 0] \tag{68}$$

while the crude bound

$$\left| \cup_{i \in \nu_\ell(\alpha_n)} \Sigma_i \right| \geq K_{1,n} \mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha_n)| > 0] \tag{69}$$

always holds. These bounds lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left[B_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c \mid \Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_\ell\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{\binom{P - \max(K_{1,n}, X_{n,\nu_\ell(\alpha_n)} + 1) \mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha_n)| > 0]}{|\Sigma|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma|}} \right]^{n-\ell}
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Conditioning on $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_\ell$ and $\{B_{ij}(\alpha_n), 1 \leq i < j \leq \ell\}$, we then get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}\left[C_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\right] \mathbf{1}\left[B_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c\right]\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[ \mathbf{1}[C_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] \left( \frac{\binom{P - \max(K_{1,n}, X_{n,\nu_\ell(\alpha_n)} + 1) \mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha_n)| > 0]}{|\Sigma|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma|}} \right)^{n-\ell} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[C_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)] \mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{\binom{P - \max(K_{1,n}, X_{n,\nu_\ell(\alpha_n)} + 1) \mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha_n)| > 0]}{|\Sigma|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma|}} \right]^{n-\ell}
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

since $C_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ is fully determined by $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_\ell$ and $\{B_{ij}(\alpha_n), 1 \leq i < j \leq \ell\}$, and $B_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)$ and $E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)$ are independent from $\{B_{ij}(\alpha_n), 1 \leq i, j \leq \ell\}$.

The next result establishes bounds for both terms at (71).

**Lemma 7.2.** *Consider a distribution* $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_r)$, *integers* $K_1 \leq \cdots \leq K_r \leq P/2$, *and* $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. *With* $\boldsymbol{X}_n$ *as specified in (60),* $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ *and* $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, *we have*

$$\mathbb{P}[C_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta})] \leq \min\left\{1, \ell^{\ell-2} \left(\alpha p_{rr}\right)^{\ell-1}\right\} \tag{72}$$

*and*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\binom{P-\max(K_1,X_{n,\nu_\ell(\alpha)}+1)\mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|>0]}{|\Sigma|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma|}}\right] \le \min\Big\{1-\alpha\lambda_1, \min\{1-\mu_r+\mu_r e^{-\alpha p_{1r}\beta\ell}, e^{-\alpha p_{11}\beta\ell}\}+e^{-\gamma K_1}\mathbf{1}[\ell>L_n]\Big\} \tag{73}$$

The proof of Lemma 7.2 is given in Appendix B.

Our proof of (63) will be completed (see (66)) upon establishing

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{\ell=2}^{\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor}\binom{n}{\ell}\mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n,\boldsymbol{X}_n)^c]=0 \tag{74}$$

by means of (71), (72), and (73). These steps are taken in the next section.

## 8. Establishing (74)

We will establish (74) in several steps with each step focusing on a specific range of the summation over $\ell$. Throughout, we consider a scalings $K_1,\dots,K_r,P:\mathbb{N}_0\to\mathbb{N}_0^{r+1}$ and $\alpha:\mathbb{N}_0\to(0,1)$ such that (7) holds with $c>1$, (12), and (11) hold.

*1) The case where $2\le\ell\le R$:* This range considers fixed values of $\ell$. Pick an integer $R$ to be specified later at (80). Use (7), (21), (25), (71), (72), and the first bound in (73) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\ell=2}^{R}\binom{n}{\ell}\mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n,\boldsymbol{X}_n)^c]\\
&\le\sum_{\ell=2}^{R}\left(\frac{en}{\ell}\right)^{\ell}\ell^{\ell-2}\left(\alpha_n p_{rr}(n)\right)^{\ell-1}\left(1-\alpha_n\lambda_1(n)\right)^{n-\ell}\\
&\le\sum_{\ell=2}^{R}(en)^{\ell}\left(\frac{(\log n)^2}{n}\right)^{\ell-1}\left(1-c_n\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{n-\ell}\\
&\le\sum_{\ell=2}^{R}n\left(e(\log n)^2\right)^{\ell}e^{-c_n\log n\frac{n-\ell}{n}}\\
&=\sum_{\ell=2}^{R}\left(e(\log n)^2\right)^{\ell}n^{1-c_n\frac{n-\ell}{n}}
\end{aligned}$$

With $c>1$, we have $\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(1-c_n\frac{n-\ell}{n}\right)=1-c<0$. Thus, for each $\ell=2,3,\dots$, we have

$$\left(e(\log n)^2\right)^{\ell-1}n^{1-c_n\frac{n-\ell}{n}}=o(1),$$

whence we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{\ell=2}^{R}\binom{n}{\ell}\mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n,\boldsymbol{X}_n)^c]=0.$$

*2) The case where $R+1\le\ell\le\min\{L_n,\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}\rfloor\}$:* Our goal in this and the next subsubsection is to cover the range $R+1\le\ell\le\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}\rfloor$. Since the bound given at (73) takes a different form when $\ell>L_n$, we first consider the range $R+1\le\ell\le\min\{L_n,\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}\rfloor\}$. Using (21), (25), (71), (72), and the second bound in (73) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\ell=R+1}^{\min\{L_n,\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}\rfloor\}}\binom{n}{\ell}\mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n,\boldsymbol{X}_n)^c]\\
&\le\sum_{\ell=R+1}^{\min\{L_n,\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}\rfloor\}}\left(\frac{en}{\ell}\right)^{\ell}\ell^{\ell-2}\left(\frac{(\log n)^2}{n}\right)^{\ell-1}\cdot\\
&\qquad\cdot\left(1-\mu_r\left(1-e^{-\alpha_n\beta\ell p_{1r}(n)}\right)\right)^{n-\ell}
\end{aligned}\tag{75}$$

From the upper bound in (20) and $\ell\le\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}$, we have

$$\alpha_n\beta\ell p_{1r}(n)\le\alpha_n\beta\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}\frac{c_n}{\mu_r}\frac{\log n}{n\alpha_n}=1.$$

Using the fact that $1-e^{-x}\ge\frac{x}{2}$ for all $0\le x\le 1$, we get

$$1-\mu_r\Big(1-e^{-\alpha_n\beta\ell p_{1r}(n)}\Big)\le 1-\frac{\mu_r\alpha_n\beta\ell p_{1r}(n)}{2}\le e^{-\beta\ell c_n\mu_r\frac{\log n}{2n}} \tag{76}$$

using the lower bound in (20). Reporting this last bound in to (75) and noting that

$$n-\ell\ge\frac{n}{2},\qquad \ell=2,3,\dots,\left\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\right\rfloor, \tag{77}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\ell=R+1}^{\min\{L_n,\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}\rfloor\}}\binom{n}{\ell}\mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n,\boldsymbol{X}_n)^c]\\
&\le\sum_{\ell=R+1}^{\min\{L_n,\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}\rfloor\}}n\left(e(\log n)^2\right)^{\ell}e^{-\beta\ell c_n\mu_r\frac{\log n}{2n}\frac{n}{2}}\\
&\le n\sum_{\ell=R+1}^{\min\{L_n,\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}\rfloor\}}\left(e\,(\log n)^2\,e^{-\beta c_n\frac{\mu_r}{4}\log n}\right)^{\ell}\\
&\le n\sum_{\ell=R+1}^{\infty}\left(e\,(\log n)^2\,e^{-\beta c_n\frac{\mu_r}{4}\log n}\right)^{\ell}
\end{aligned}\tag{78}$$

Given that $\beta,\mu_r>0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}c_n=c>0$ we clearly have

$$e\,(\log n)^2\,e^{-\beta c_n\log n\frac{\mu_r}{4}}=o(1). \tag{79}$$

Thus, the geometric series in (78) is summable, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\ell=R+1}^{\min\{L_n,\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n\log n}\rfloor\}}\binom{n}{\ell}\mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n)\cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\theta}_n,\boldsymbol{X}_n)^c]\\
&\le(1+o(1))\,n\left(e\,(\log n)^2\,e^{-\beta c_n\log n\frac{\mu_r}{4}}\right)^{R+1}\\
&=(1+o(1))\,n^{1-(R+1)\beta c_n\frac{\mu_r}{4}}\left(e(\log n)^2\right)^{R+1}\\
&=o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

for any positive integer $R$ with

$$R>\frac{8}{\beta c\mu_r}. \tag{80}$$

This choice is permissible given that $c,\beta,\mu_r>0$.

*3) The case where* $\min\{\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor, \max(R, L_n)\} < \ell \leq \lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor$*:* Clearly, this range becomes obsolete if $\max(R, L_n) \geq \lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor$. Thus, it suffices to consider the subsequences for which the range $\max(R, L_n) + 1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor$ is non-empty. There, we use (21), (25), (71), (72), and the second bound in (73) to get

$$\sum_{\ell=\max(R,L_n)+1}^{\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor} \binom{n}{\ell} \mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] \quad (81)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\ell=\max(R,L_n)+1}^{\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor} \left(\frac{en}{\ell}\right)^{\ell} \ell^{\ell-2} \left(\frac{(\log n)^2}{n}\right)^{\ell-1} \cdot \left(1 - \mu_r \left(1 - e^{-\beta \ell \alpha_n p_{1r}(n)}\right) + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \cdot$$

$$\leq \sum_{\ell=\max(R,L_n)+1}^{\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{2\beta c \log n}\rfloor} n \left(e (\log n)^2\right)^{\ell} \left(e^{-\beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n}} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}$$

where in the last step we used (76) in view of $\ell \leq \frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}$.

Next, we write

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n}} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}} \\ &= e^{-\beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n}} \left(1 + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n} + \beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n}}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left\{-\beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n} + \beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n}}\right\} \\ &\leq \exp\left\{-\beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n} \left(1 - \frac{e^{-\gamma K_{1,n} + \frac{\mu_r^2}{2}}}{\beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n}}\right)\right\} \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

where the last inequality is obtained from $\ell \leq \frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}$. Using the fact that $\ell > L_n = \min\{\lfloor\frac{P_n}{K_{1,n}}\rfloor, \lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor\}$ and (11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}}{\beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n}} &\leq \max\left\{\frac{K_{1,n}}{P_n}, \frac{2}{n}\right\} 2n \frac{e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}}{\beta c_n \mu_r \log n} \\ &\leq \max\left\{\frac{2K_{1,n} e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}}{\beta c_n \mu_r \sigma \log n}, \frac{4e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}}{\beta c_n \mu_r \log n}\right\} \\ &= o(1) \end{aligned}$$

by virtue of (23) and the facts that $\beta, \mu_r, \sigma, c_n > 0$. Reporting this into (82), we see that for for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finite integer $n^*(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\left(e^{-\beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n}} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}\right) \leq e^{-\beta \ell c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n}(1-\epsilon)} \quad (83)$$

for all $n \geq n^*(\epsilon)$. Using (83) in (81), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\ell=\max(R,L_n)+1}^{\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor} \binom{n}{\ell} \mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] \\ &\leq n \sum_{\ell=\max(R,L_n)+1}^{\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor} \left(e (\log n)^2 e^{-\beta c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{2n}(1-\epsilon)\frac{n}{2}}\right)^{\ell} \\ &\leq n \sum_{\ell=\max(R,L_n)+1}^{\infty} \left(e (\log n)^2 e^{-\beta c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{4}(1-\epsilon)}\right)^{\ell} \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Similar to (79), we have $e (\log n)^2 e^{-\beta c_n \mu_r \frac{\log n}{4}(1-\epsilon)} = o(1)$ so that the sum in (84) converges. Following a similar approach to that in Section 8-2, we then see that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{\ell=\max(R,L_n)+1}^{\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{2\beta c \log n}\rfloor} \binom{n}{\ell} \mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] = 0$$

with $R$ selected according to (80) and $\epsilon < 1/2$.

*4) The case where* $\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor + 1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor \nu n \rfloor$*:* We consider $\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor + 1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor \nu n \rfloor$ for some $\nu \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ to be specified later. Recall (20), (25), (71), the first bound in (72), and the second bound in (73). Noting that $\binom{n}{\ell}$ is monotone increasing in $\ell$ when $0 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor$ and using (77) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\ell=\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor \nu n \rfloor} \binom{n}{\ell} \mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor \nu n \rfloor} \binom{n}{\lfloor \nu n \rfloor} \left(1 - \mu_r + \mu_r e^{-\alpha_n \beta \ell p_{1r}(n)} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n}\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor \nu n \rfloor} \left(\frac{e}{\nu}\right)^{\nu n} \left(1 - \mu_r + \mu_r e^{-\alpha_n \beta \frac{\mu_r n}{\beta c_n \log n} \frac{c_n \log n}{n \alpha_n}} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \\ &\leq n \left(\frac{e}{\nu}\right)^{\nu n} \left(1 - \mu_r + \mu_r e^{-\mu_r} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \\ &= n \left(\left(\frac{e}{\nu}\right)^{2\nu} \left(1 - \mu_r + \mu_r e^{-\mu_r} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}\right)\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

We have $1 - \mu_r + \mu_r e^{-\mu_r} < 1$ from $\mu_r > 0$ and $e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}} = o(1)$ from (23). Also, it holds that $\lim_{\nu\to 0} \left(\frac{e}{\nu}\right)^{2\nu} = 1$. Thus, if we pick $\nu$ small enough to ensure that

$$\left(\frac{e}{\nu}\right)^{2\nu} \left(1 - \mu_r + \mu_r e^{-\mu_r}\right) < 1, \quad (86)$$

then for any $0 < \epsilon < 1 - (e/\nu)^{2\nu} \left(1 - \mu_r + \mu_r e^{-\mu_r}\right)$ there exists a finite integer $n^\star(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\left(\frac{e}{\nu}\right)^{2\nu} \left(1 - \mu_r + \mu_r e^{-\mu_r} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}\right) \leq 1 - \epsilon, \quad \forall n \geq n^\star(\epsilon).$$

Reporting this into (85), we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{\ell=\lfloor\frac{\mu_r n}{2\beta c \log n}\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor \nu n \rfloor} \binom{n}{\ell} \mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] = 0$$

since $\lim_{n\to\infty} n(1-\epsilon)^{n/2} = 0$.

*5) The case where* $\lfloor \nu n \rfloor + 1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor$*:* In this range, we use (26), (71), the first bound in (72), the last bound in (73), and (77) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\ell=\lfloor \nu n \rfloor+1}^{\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor} \binom{n}{\ell} \mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=\lfloor \nu n \rfloor+1}^{\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor} \binom{n}{\ell} \left(e^{-\beta \ell \alpha_n p_{11}(n)} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \left( \sum_{\ell=\lfloor \nu n \rfloor +1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \binom{n}{\ell} \right) \left( e^{-\beta \nu n \alpha_n p_{11}(n)} + e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}}$$

$$\leq \left( 4e^{-\beta \nu n \alpha_n p_{11}(n)} + 4e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}}$$

With $\beta, \nu, \gamma > 0$ have $e^{-\beta \nu n \alpha_n p_{11}(n)} = o(1)$ from (12) and $e^{-\gamma K_{1,n}} = o(1)$ from (23). The conclusion

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{\ell=\lfloor \nu n \rfloor +1}^{L_n} \binom{n}{\ell} \mathbb{P}[A_{n,\ell}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n) \cap E_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, \boldsymbol{X}_n)^c] = 0$$

immediately follows and the proof of one-law is completed. ■

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work has been supported in part by National Science Foundation through grant CCF #1422165, by the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Carnegie Mellon University (CMU), by a Berkman Faculty Development Grant from CMU, and a generous gift from Persistent Systems, Inc.

## REFERENCES

[1] I. Akyildiz, W. Su, Y. Sankarasubramaniam, and E. Cayirci, "A survey on sensor networks," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 40, no. 8, pp. 102–114, Aug 2002.

[2] L. Eschenauer and V. D. Gligor, "A key-management scheme for distributed sensor networks," in *Proceedings of the 9th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '02. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2002, pp. 41–47. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/586110.586117

[3] A. Perrig, J. Stankovic, and D. Wagner, "Security in wireless sensor networks," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 47, no. 6, pp. 53–57, Jun. 2004. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/990680.990707

[4] X. Du and H.-H. Chen, "Security in wireless sensor networks," *Wireless Communications, IEEE*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 60–66, Aug 2008.

[5] S. A. Çamtepe and B. Yener, "Key distribution mechanisms for wireless sensor networks: a survey," *Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York, Technical Report*, pp. 05–07, 2005.

[6] O. Yağan, "Zero-one laws for connectivity in inhomogeneous random key graphs," *ArXiv e-prints*, Aug 2015, available online at http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.02407.

[7] M. Yarvis, N. Kushalnagar, H. Singh, A. Rangarajan, Y. Liu, and S. Singh, "Exploiting heterogeneity in sensor networks," in *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies. IEEE INFOCOM 2005*, vol. 2, March 2005, pp. 878–890 vol. 2.

[8] C. J. Colbourn, "Combinatorial aspects of network reliability," *Annals of Operations Research*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 1–15.

[9] B. Bollobás, *Random graphs*. Cambridge university press, 2001, vol. 73.

[10] L. Valiant, "The complexity of enumeration and reliability problems," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 410–421, 1979. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/0208032

[11] J. Provan and M. Ball, "The complexity of counting cuts and of computing the probability that a graph is connected," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 777–788, 1983. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/0212053

[12] J. Zhao, O. Yağan, and V. Gligor, "On the strengths of connectivity and robustness in general random intersection graphs," in *IEEE 53rd Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 2014*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 3661–3668.

[13] J. Zhao, O. Yağan, and V. Gligor, "On connectivity and robustness in random intersection graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, accepted for publication.

[14] O. Yağan, "Performance of the Eschenauer-Gligor key distribution scheme under an ON/OFF channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3821–3835, June 2012.

[15] O. Yağan and A. M. Makowski, "Zero–one laws for connectivity in random key graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 2983–2999, 2012.

[16] M. Bloznelis, J. Jaworski, and K. Rybarczyk, "Component evolution in a secure wireless sensor network," *Netw.*, vol. 53, pp. 19–26, January 2009.

[17] E. Godehardt and J. Jaworski, "Two models of random intersection graphs for classification," in *Exploratory data analysis in empirical research*. Springer, 2003, pp. 67–81.

[18] R. Di Pietro, L. V. Mancini, A. Mei, A. Panconesi, and J. Radhakrishnan, "Redoubtable sensor networks," *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 13:1–13:22, Mar. 2008.

[19] J. Zhao, O. Yağan, and V. Gligor, "$k$-connectivity in random key graphs with unreliable links," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 3810–3836, 2015.

[20] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński, *Random Graphs. 2000*. Wiley–Intersci. Ser. Discrete Math. Optim, 2000.

[21] S. T. Jensen, "The laguerre-samuelson inequality with extensions and applications in statistics and matrix theory," Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University, 1999.

[22] O. Yağan, "Random graph modeling of key distribution scheme in wireless sensor networks," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park (MD), 2011.

[23] O. Yağan and A. M. Makowski, "On the gradual deployment of random pairwise key distribution schemes," in *Modeling and Optimization in Mobile, Ad Hoc and Wireless Networks (WiOpt), 2011 International Symposium on*, May 2011, pp. 257–264.

[24] O. Yağan and A. M. Makowski, "Modeling the pairwise key predistribution scheme in the presence of unreliable links," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 1740–1760, March 2013.

[25] G. E. Martin, *Counting: The art of enumerative combinatorics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

## APPENDIX A
## A PROOF OF LEMMA 5.4

We know from (9) that

$$\lambda_1(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \mu_j p_{1j} = c_n \frac{\log n}{\alpha_n n}.$$

Since $p_{1j}$ is monotone increasing in $j = 1, \ldots, r$ by virtue of (17), we readily obtain the bounds

$$c_n \frac{\log n}{n \alpha_n} \leq p_{1r}(n) \leq \frac{c_n}{\mu_r} \frac{\log n}{n \alpha_n} \tag{A.1}$$

which establishes (20).

In view of (A.1) that implies $p_{1r}(n) = \Theta(\frac{\log n}{\alpha_n n})$, we will obtain (21) if we show that $p_{rr}(n) = o(\log n) p_{1r}(n)$. Here this will be established by showing that

$$p_{rr}(n) \leq \max \left( 2, \frac{8 c_n}{\mu_r} \frac{\log n}{w_n} \right) p_{1r}(n), \quad n = 2, 3, \ldots \tag{A.2}$$

for some sequence $w_n$ such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} w_n = \infty$. Fix $n = 2, 3, \ldots$. We have either $p_{1r}(n) > \frac{1}{2}$, or $p_{1r}(n) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. In the former case, it automatically holds that

$$p_{rr}(n) \leq 2 p_{1r}(n) \tag{A.3}$$

by virtue of the fact that $p_{rr}(n) \leq 1$.

Assume now that $p_{1r}(n) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. We know from [15, Propositions 7.1-7.2] that

$$1 - e^{-\frac{K_{j,n} K_{r,n}}{P_n}} \leq p_{jr}(n) \leq \frac{K_{j,n} K_{r,n}}{P_n - K_{j,n}}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, r \tag{A.4}$$

and it follows that

$$\frac{K_{1,n} K_{r,n}}{P_n} \leq \log \left( \frac{1}{1 - p_{1r}(n)} \right) \leq \log 2 < 1. \tag{A.5}$$

Using the fact that $1-e^{-x} \geq \frac{x}{2}$ with $x$ in $(0,1)$, we then get

$$p_{1r}(n) \geq \frac{K_{1,n}K_{r,n}}{2P_n}. \tag{A.6}$$

In addition, using the upper bound in (A.4) with $j=r$ gives

$$p_{rr}(n) \leq \frac{K_{r,n}^2}{P_n - K_{r,n}} \leq 2\frac{K_{r,n}^2}{P_n}$$

as we invoke (6). Combining the last two bounds we obtain

$$\frac{p_{rr}(n)}{p_{11}(n)} \leq 4\frac{K_{r,n}}{K_{1,n}} \tag{A.7}$$

In order to bound the term $K_{r,n}/K_{1,n}$, we recall from Lemma 5.5 that (12) implies (22), i.e., that $\frac{K_{1,n}^2}{P_n} = \frac{w_n}{n\alpha_n}$, for some sequence $w_n$ satisfying $\lim_{n\to\infty} w_n = \infty$. Using this together with (A.6) and (A.1) we then get

$$\frac{K_{r,n}}{K_{1,n}} = \frac{\frac{K_{1,n}K_{r,n}}{P_n}}{\frac{K_{1,n}^2}{P_n}} \leq \frac{2p_{1r}(n)}{\frac{w_n}{n\alpha_n}} \leq \frac{2\frac{c_n}{\mu_r}\frac{\log n}{n\alpha_n}}{\frac{w_n}{n\alpha_n}} = \frac{2c_n}{\mu_r}\frac{\log n}{w_n}$$

Reporting this into (A.7) we get

$$p_{rr}(n) \leq \frac{8c_n}{\mu_r}\frac{\log n}{w_n}p_{1r}(n). \tag{A.8}$$

Combining (A.3) and (A.8), we readily obtain (A.2).

## Appendix B
## Establishing Lemma 7.2

The bounds given at Lemma 7.2 are valid irrespective of how the parameters involved scale with $n$. Thus, we consider fixed $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ with constraints given in the statement of Lemma 7.2.

We first establish (73) starting with the first bound. Recall that $|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|$ is a Binomial rv with $\ell$ trials and success probability $\alpha$. Recall also the rv $Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ defined at (44). Using a crude bound and then (19) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\binom{P-\max(K_1,X_{n,\nu_\ell(\alpha)}+1)\mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|>0]}{|\Sigma|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma|}}\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\binom{P-K_1\mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|>0]}{|\Sigma|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma|}}\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{\mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|>0]}\right] \\
&= (1-\alpha)^\ell + \left(1-(1-\alpha)^\ell\right)\mathbb{E}[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \\
&\leq 1-\alpha+\alpha\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right] \\
&\leq 1-\alpha\lambda_1(n).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

upon noting that $\mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right] = 1-\lambda_1 \leq 1$.

Next, consider range $\ell = 1,\ldots,L_n$, where we have

$$\left(X_{n,\nu_\ell(\alpha)}+1\right)\mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|>0] \geq \lceil \beta\,|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|\,K_1\rceil$$

Recalling (19), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\binom{P-\max(K_1,X_{n,\nu_\ell(\alpha)}+1)\mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|>0]}{|\Sigma|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma|}}\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\binom{P-\beta|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|K_1}{|\Sigma|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma|}}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{\beta|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=0}^{\ell}\binom{\ell}{j}\alpha^j(1-\alpha)^{\ell-j}Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{\beta j}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1-\alpha\left(1-Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\beta\right)\right)^\ell\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1-\alpha\beta\left(1-Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)\right)^\ell\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\alpha(1-Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\beta\ell}\right]
\end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

using the fact that $1-Z(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\beta \geq \beta(1-Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ with $Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$; a proof is available at [14, Lemma 5.2]. On the range $\ell = L_n+1,\ldots,\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor$, $|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|$ can be less than or greater than $L_n$. In the latter case, we have

$$\max(K_1, X_{n,\nu_\ell(\alpha)}+1)\mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|>0] \geq \lfloor\gamma P\rfloor + 1$$

Using (B.10) and the fact that (see [22, Lemma 5.4.1] for a proof)

$$\binom{P-K_1}{K_2}\Big/\binom{P}{K_2} \leq e^{-\frac{K_2}{P}K_1}$$

for $K_1+K_2 \leq P$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\binom{P-\max(K_1,X_{n,\nu_\ell(\alpha)}+1)\mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|>0]}{|\Sigma|}}{\binom{P}{|\Sigma|}}\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\alpha(1-Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\beta\ell}\mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|\leq L_n]\right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{|\Sigma|}{P}(\lfloor\gamma P\rfloor+1)}\mathbf{1}[|\nu_\ell(\alpha)|>L_n]\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\alpha(1-Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\beta\ell}\right] + e^{-\gamma K_1}\mathbf{1}[\ell > L_n]
\end{aligned} \tag{B.11}$$

by virtue of the fact that $|\Sigma| \geq K_1$.

Finally, we get (73) from (B.9) and (B.11) by noting that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\alpha(1-Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\beta\ell}\right] = \sum_{j=1}^{r}\mu_j e^{-\alpha p_{1j}\beta\ell} \leq (1-\mu_r) + \mu_r e^{-\alpha p_{1r}\beta\ell}$$

and that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\alpha(1-Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\beta\ell}\right] = \sum_{j=1}^{r}\mu_j e^{-\alpha p_{1j}\beta\ell} \leq e^{-\alpha p_{11}\beta\ell} \tag{B.12}$$

The last step used the fact that $p_{ij}$ is monotone increasing in both $i$ and $j$.

Next, we establish (72). This is a version of a fairly standard bound derived previously for various other random graph models including ER graphs [9], random key graphs [15], and random $K$-out graphs [23], [24]. The proof is very similar to that of [6, Proposition 9.1] and [14, Lemma 10.2]. We give it here for completeness.

Let $\mathbb{G}_\ell(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})$ denote the subgraph of $\mathbb{G}(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})$ induced on the vertices $\{v_1,\ldots,v_\ell\}$. $\mathbb{G}_\ell(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})$ is connected if and only if it contains a spanning tree; i.e., we have

$$C_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta}) = \cup_{T\in\mathcal{T}_\ell}\left[T \subseteq \mathbb{G}_\ell(n;\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Theta})\right]$$

where $\mathcal{T}_\ell$ denotes the collection of all spanning trees on the vertices $\{v_1, \ldots, v_\ell\}$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}[C_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta})] \leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell} \mathbb{P}\left[T \subseteq \mathbb{G}_\ell(n; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta})\right]. \tag{B.13}$$

Given that $K_1 \leq K_2 \leq \ldots \leq K_r$, the probability of $T$ being contained in $\mathbb{G}_\ell(n; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta})$ is maximized when all nodes receive the largest possible number $K_r$ of keys. Thus, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}$ and distribution $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left[T \subseteq \mathbb{G}_\ell(n; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Theta})\right] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[T \subseteq \mathbb{G}_\ell(n; \boldsymbol{\mu} = \{0, 0, \ldots, 1\}, \boldsymbol{\Theta})\right] \\ &= (\alpha p_{rr})^{\ell - 1} \end{aligned} \tag{B.14}$$

where the last equality follows from the facts that i) a tree on $\ell$ vertices contain $\ell - 1$ edges, and ii) since all nodes have the same key ring size, edges in $\mathbb{G}_\ell(n; \boldsymbol{\mu} = \{0, 0, \ldots, 1\}, \boldsymbol{\Theta})$ are *pairwise* independent; see [15, Lemma 9.1] and [14, Eq. 64]. We obtain (72) upon using (B.14) in (B.13) and noting by Cayley's formula [25] that there are $\ell^{\ell-2}$ trees on $\ell$ vertices, i.e., $|\mathcal{T}_\ell| = \ell^{\ell-2}$. ■